

REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Final Office Action mailed on August 10, 2005 in which Claim 66 was allowed; in which Claims 9-11, 18, 45 and 53 were objected to; and in which Claims 1-8, 14-17, 19-23, 29-38, 40-44, 46, 49-52, 54, 57, 59 and 61-65 were rejected. With this response, Applicant respectfully requests entry of amendments canceling Claims 9, 20, 21, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35-41, 52, 53 and 59; amending Claims 1, 10, 11, 17, 19, 22, 31, 49 and 64; and adding Claims 67 and 68. Upon entry of such amendments, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-8, 10-11, 14-19, 22-23, 31, 34, 42-46, 49-51, 54, 57 and 61-68. Upon allowance of Claims 1, 22 and 49, Applicant respectfully requests reinstatement of withdrawn Claims 12-13, 24-28, 47-48 and 55-56 which depend from such generic claims. Accordingly, Claims 1-8, 10-19, 22-28, 31, 34, 42-51, 54-57, and 61-66 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Examiner Interview Summary.

On October 6, 2005, a telephonic interview was held between Examiner Liang and Applicant's attorney, Todd A. Rathe. The rejection of Claim 64 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 was discussed. It was tentatively agreed upon that Claim 64, as amended above, would overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The rejection of Claim 17 based upon Smith and Mizutani It was tentatively agreed upon that Claim 17, as amended to clarify the meaning of lateral overcomes the rejection.

Lastly, Claim 57 was discussed. It was pointed out that Claim 57 recites that the controller itself emits the heat as compared to the controller generating control signals for directing a separate device that generates heat. It was tentatively agreed upon the Smith does not show a controller itself that emits heat.

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Liang for the opportunity to discuss the rejections and for Examiner Liang's willingness to contact Applicant's attorney to discuss any further minor concerns that may exist after review of this response.

II. Rejection of Claims 64 and 65 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 Second Paragraph.

Page 2 of the Office Action rejected Claims 64 and 65 under 35 U.S. C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and succinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Per the Examiner interview held on October 6, 2005, Claim 64 is amended. It is believed that Claim 64, as amended, overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

III. Rejection of Claim 57 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Based Upon Smith.

Page 2 of the Office Action rejected Claim 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith, U.S. Patent No. 5,020,244. As noted above, it was tentatively agreed upon during the Examiner interview held on October 5, 2005 that Smith fails to disclose a controller that emits heat, wherein the pressurized air source creates air flow such that the air flow is heated by the heat emitted from the controller. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 57 be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 1-5, 8, 14-17, 19, 22-23, 31, 34-38, 40-44, 46, 49-52, 54, 58-59 and 61-63 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Smith and Mizutani.

Page 3 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1-5, 8, 14-17, 19, 22-23, 31, 34-38, 40-44, 46, 49-52, 54, 58-59 and 61-63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith, U.S. Patent No. 5,020,244, in view of Mizutani, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,439,712. With this response, Claims 1, 19, 22, 31 and 49 are amended. Claims 35-38, 40-41, 52 and 59 are cancelled. Claims 1-5, 8, 14-17, 19, 22-23, 31, 34, 42-44, 46, 49-51, 54 and 61-63, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Smith and Mizutani.

A. Claim 1.

Page 14 of the Office Action indicated that Claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any

intervening claims. In response, independent Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the limitations of Claim 9 which is hereby cancelled. Accordingly, Claim 1, as amended, overcomes the objection based upon Smith and Mizutani. Claims 2-5, 8, 14-17, 42-44, 46 and 61-63 depend from Claim 1 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

B. Claim 19.

With this response, Applicant's entry of amendments to Claim 19 adding the limitations of dependent Claims 20 and 21 which are hereby cancelled. Claim 19, as amended, recites a heat source which comprises control components, wherein the components offer resistance to electrical current passing therethrough to provide heat while also serving to support operation of the inkjet printing mechanism. As noted above, during the Examiner interview on October 6, 2005, it was tentatively agreed upon that neither Smith nor Mizutani teach or disclose a control component that supports operation of the inkjet printing mechanism while also providing heat for heating an air flow that is directed at printed upon media. In contrast, Smith merely discloses a control that controls a separate heating mechanism dedicated for providing heat. The separate heating mechanism is not a control component serving to support operation of the inkjet printing mechanism. Accordingly, Claim 19, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Smith and Mizutani.

C. Claim 22.

With this reply, Applicant requests entry of amendments to Claim 22 adding the limitations of dependent claims 29 and 30 which are hereby cancelled. Claim 22, as amended, recites a heat source comprising electric components directing operation of the inkjet printing mechanism and offering resistance to electric current passing therethrough to emit heat. As discussed during the Examiner interview held on October 6, 2005, neither Smith nor Mizutani disclose an ink drying system that utilizes heat emitted from the controller itself to heat air flow that is directed at media. Accordingly, Claim 22, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon

Smith and Mizutani. Claim 23 depends from Claim 22 and overcomes rejection for the same reasons.

D. Claim 31.

With this reply, Applicant requests entry of amendments to Claim 31 adding the limitations of Claims 32 and 33 which are hereby cancelled. Claim 31, as amended, recites heat energy supplying means which comprises electric control component means for supporting operation of an inkjet printing mechanism means for producing the print imaging and for offering resistance to electric current passing therethrough such that the control component means emit heat. As further recited in Claim 31, the heat emitted from the electric control component means is utilized to heat air flow that is directed at media. As noted during the Examiner interview held on October 6, 2005, neither Smith nor Mizutani disclose a system in which heat emitted from the controller itself is utilized (recycled) to heat air flow directed at the media. Accordingly, Claim 31, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Smith and Mizutani. Claim 34 depends from Claim 31 and overcomes the rejections for the same reasons.

E. Claim 49.

Page 14 of the Office Action indicated that Claim 53 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Claim 49 is amended to incorporate the limitations of dependent Claim 53 and intervening Claim 52, which are hereby cancelled. Thus, Claim 49, as amended overcomes the rejection based upon Smith and Mizutani. Claims 50 and 51 depend from Claim 49 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

V. Rejection of Claims 6-7, 20-21, 29-30 and 32-33 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Smith, Mizutani and Martinengo.

With this response, Claims 20 and 21, 29-30 and 32-33 are cancelled. Claims 6 and 7 depend from Claim 1 and overcome the rejection based upon Smith,

Mizutani and Martinengo for the same reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

VI. Added Claims.

With this Response, Applicant respectfully requests entry of amendments adding Claims 67 and 68. Added Claims 67 and 68 are presented for consideration and allowance.

A. Claim 67.

As noted above, during the Examiner interview held on October 6, 2005, it was tentatively agreed upon that Claim 17, as amended, overcame the rejection based upon Smith and Mizutani. In response, dependent Claim 17, including the amendments to Claim 17, is re-written in independent form as added Claim 67, further including all of the limitations of former base Claim 1 and intervening Claim 16. Neither Smith nor Mizutani, alone or in combination, disclose airflow having a second directional component that varies in a direction generally lateral to a direction of the media passing through the printzone and has a greater magnitude at a laterally outermost portion of the media relative to a laterally-central portion of the media. Thus, added Claim 67 is believed to be patentably distinct of the prior art of record.

B. Claim 68.

Page 14 of the Office Action indicated that Claim 45 would be allowable if re-written in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Claim 45 is re-written as added independent Claim 68 and includes all the limitations of former base Claim 1 and intervening Claim 45. Thus, Claim 68 is believed to be patentably distinct of the prior art of record.

VII. Conclusion.

After amending the claims as set forth above, Claims 1-8, 10-19, 22-28, 31, 34, 42-51, 54-57, and 61-66 are now pending in this application.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Oct. 11, 2005

By Todd A. Rathe

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22879
Telephone: (414) 297-5710
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276